United States Department of Agriculture
Agricultural Adjustment Administration
Washington, D. C.

CONFERENCE ON DEVELOPMENT OF A PROGRAM FOR AGRICULTURE
UNDER THE SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, MARCH 9, 10 and 11

Farmers' farmers' representatives and those concerned with administration problems have been invited to attend this and other regional conferences to advise and assist officials of the United States Department of Agriculture on the development of a national agricultural program for 1936 under the provisions of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act.

The list of states represented in the invitations issued for the Salt Lake City conference includes Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming.

Among those invited to attend the conference from each of the states of this region are representative farmers, representatives of the leading farm organizations, representatives of the Land Grant Colleges, State Commissioners of Agriculture, State Supervisors of Vocational Agricultural Education, and editors of the leading farm journals.

The group of officials of the United States Department of Agriculture attending the conference is headed by M. L. Wilson, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, and includes Prew Savoy of the Legal Division and W. A. Lloyd of the Federal Agricultural Extension Service, United States Department of Agriculture, and George E. Farrell and B. G. Thorne of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration.

It is expected that the first day of the conference will be devoted to consideration of the agricultural situation, provisions of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, and features of the program to be developed for 1936. It is expected that committees to consider the problems peculiar to the various commodities and regions will be formed, and that their recommendations will be requested.

In general, the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act provides for preservation and improvement of national soil resources, reestablishment and maintenance of farmers' purchasing power, assurance of adequate supplies of foods and fibers for consumers, and the protection of rivers and harbors against the effects of soil erosiion.

Temporary Federal aid in the form of payments direct to individual farmers to assist voluntary action by them, designed to accomplish the soil conservation purposes, is authorized until state plans are ready or until January 1, 1938. Commencing in 1938, grants will be made only to states, upon approval of state programs by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the provisions of the Act. These state plans are to include as a principal objective the reestablishment of farmers' purchasing power, and may provide for

production control.

Under the temporary plan of Federal aid, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make soil conservation payments to producers measured by (1) their treatment or use of land for soil restoration, conservation, or erosion prevention, (2) changes in the use of their land, and (3) the domestic allotment of one or more designated commodities. Productivity of the land affected, measured by changes in use of land or treatment of land for soil conservation, is to be taken into consideration in making payments.

The Act contains a requirement that the interests of share-croppers, tenants, and small producers be protected, and tenants and share-croppers are specifically included in the Act as agricultural producers.

The Act authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to utilize county and community committees of agricultural producers in carrying out its provisions.

The August, 1909-July, 1914 balance between agricultural and non-agricultural living standards, as measured by the relative purchasing power of the net income per person on farms and the income per person not on farms, is the objective in reestablishing and maintaining farm income.

Authorization is included for the use of funds for expansion of domestic and foreign markets or for seeking new markets for agricultural commodities or for removal or disposition of agricultural surpluses.

Provision for administration by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration is contained in the Act.

Under the permanent policy providing grants to states, which may be made immediately upon approval of state plans, the state plans must include provisions for a state administrative agency authorized by the state and agreed upon by the Secretary and the state concerned. State plans must also include provisions for participation by county and community committees or associations of producers organized for the purpose, and provisions for submitting such reports as the Secretary finds necessary to assure that the plan is being carried out.

The Act has been passed by both houses of Congress and signed by the President. This and other regional conferences are intended to assist in rapid development of a program.

- 0 -

Regional Conference on Proposed Program
under
Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act

Salt Lake City, Utah
March 9, 10 and 11, 1936

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF COUNTY PROGRAMS

R. W. Blackburn, South Pasadena, Calif., Chairman.
F. P. Lane, Laramie, Wyo., Secretary
P. H. Ross, Tucson, Arizona
E. D. Smith, Fort Collins, Colorado
L. R. Davies, Denver, Colorado
H. L. Spence, Moscow, Idaho
E. S. Pokenson, Rexburg, Idaho
J. E. Border, Bozeman, Montana
R. E. Bodley, Bozeman, Montana
W. A. Wunsch, Las Cruces, New Mexico
C. E. Hill, Pendleton, Oregon
Tracy R. Welling, Salt Lake City, Utah
W. B. Porter, Logan, Utah
R. M. Turner, Pullman, Washington
O. C. La Budde, Walla Walla, Wash

Wide and intelligent understanding of the needs of soil conservation and the plan under which the soil conservation and domestic allotment act will be carried out, is essential to its acceptance and adoption on the part of farm people.

Accordingly, extension officials should proceed promptly to assemble and disseminate information pertaining to the operation of the act as rapidly as authentic information is available.

It is important that administrative and advisory officials be fully conversant with the details of the plan and how it will operate. It is therefore recommended, first, that state-wide or district conferences be held. These conferences should include extension agents and other representatives of the College of Agriculture, the Soil Conservation Service, the state supervisory board, teachers of vocational agriculture and representatives of other agencies who may be concerned.

This type of meeting should similarly be followed by county meetings called by the county agents in co-operation with teachers of vocational agriculture, existing commodity committees and representatives of farm organizations. This county meeting should in turn be supplemented by educational meetings held in communities.

Preceding and concurrent with the educational meetings mentioned above, the use of the radio, the daily and weekly press, circular letters, telephone, office and farm calls, should be used to their fullest extent to get the needed information out to farmers.

In light of continuing research on soil conservation and related basic problems being carried on by experiment stations, the soil conservation service, and other agencies, this new information should be

(over)

carried back to counties and communities, using the same methods suggested for the 1936 program.

County planning meetings and conferences which have proved a valuable means of crystalizing thought and understanding, have met a real need and their further use is recommended. These conferences provide an opportunity for farm people to contribute much toward future development of local, regional and national programs.

We recommend that methods used in the dissemination of information for carrying out the program for 1936 be utilized by the agencies set up to administer the 1937 program.

We urge that the United States Department of Agriculture continue to furnish the state administrations with carefully prepared educational material for use in carrying out the 1936 and subsequent programs.

R. W. Blackburn, Chairman

F. P. Lane, Secretary

Regional Conference on Proposed Program
under
Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act

Salt Lake City, Utah
March 9, 10, and 11, 1936

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON CROPS AND PRACTICES ON CROP LANDS

(Committee 1-a)

Joseph Andrasen, St. Anthony, Idaho, Chm.
C. W. Rubel, Berkeley, Calif., Secy.
O. M. Lassen, Phoenix, Arizona
J. E. Morrison, Fort Collins, Colorado
A. N. Grover, Ridgedale, Idaho
Lee Doheny, Brady, Montana
R. A. Ward, Portland, Oregon
V. E. Scott, Reno, Nevada
Albert Sander, Caliente, Nevada
J. R. Ogden, Loving, New Mexico
William Steen, Pendleton, Oregon
A. G. Adney, Corinne, Utah
Troy Lindley, Dayton, Washington
D. R. Sabin, Laramie, Wyoming

The committee appointed to make recommendations regarding definition of:

(a) Soil depleting crops
(b) Soil conserving or soil improving crops
(c) Practices which are soil depleting, conserving or improving and to make recommendations of such in the matters as well as assist in providing a clear basis, determine whether producers shall be entitled to claims in connection with those practices, etc., on crop lands, after considerable discussion of the general subject, decided that consideration should be given the matters from the standpoint of irrigated lands and from the standpoint of dry farming. The committee consequently divided into two groups and the report is divided into two sections. Following is the report of the section on recommendations as they relate to dry land farming.

(over)

REPORT OF THE DRY LAND SUB-COMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE

ON CROPS AND PRACTICES ON CROP LANDS

(Committee No. 1-a)

The sub-committee of the committee on crops and practices on crop lands, on crop production and cropping practices recognizes that the details of this work as it pertains to the administration of the Soil Conservation Act, readily divides into two broad divisions which are designated and defined in the foregoing summary of the report of this sub-committee.

1. Diversion practices are those in which the land use is directed to a totally different phase of production than was previously the case. It includes the soil fertility building crops and those erosion control crops which conform to these principles in the strictest sense of the word, namely:

1. Permanent forages such as grasses and legumes
2. Tree and shrub plantings such as woodlots and shelter belts
3. Noxious weed control

It is felt that such land use and the proper maintenance of same should entitle the co-operator to the highest consideration in any matter of benefit payments which may be devised and place such diversion of farming practices in a much higher category than those which follow.

This committee recognizes that vegetation must be grown and utilized to provide protection to the soil and to maintain fertility as well as to provide food and other products for man and animals, and that protection of the soil and the maintenance of fertility must be given first consideration if we are to have a sustained production and a permanent agriculture.

II. Maintenance farming may be defined as those practices which provide for a stable land use. Even though the crops may be identical, emphasis is placed upon how and where such crops are grown and how they are utilized. Practices which are recommended meet specific requirements under varied local and regional conditions. In general tillage methods and the use of equipment which will utilize crop residues, leave the land in a rough, cloddy and trashy condition when it is not adequately protected by the standing stubble or growing crop or to supplement the growing crop, offers the most practical and immediate possibilities for controlling erosion in the dry land areas.

Those methods may include the following or combinations of the following:

1. Cover crops and green manuring crops in areas where applicable.
2. Protected summer fallow, when adapted to local conditions.
3. Strip farming.
4. Contour listing, contour tillage, and seeding methods.
5. Systematic weed and pest control.
6. Prevention of excessive grazing on crop lands and the leaving of stubble or buffer strips to reduce and control erosion.
7. Where a continuation of the best tillage methods, crop rotations utilization of crop residues and strip cropping will not control erosion such as steep slopes, draws, waterways, or in "blow outs" or on "blow" lands the land should be removed from cultivation and protected by a permanent cover of grass, trees, vines and other vegetation.
8. Recognition of the value of wild life as a farm asset should be a part of this conservation program and as such any work which is done of this

nature should have the benefit of the principles of the act.

Small grains, peas and other seed crops taken off in the form of limited pasture or green manure crop, could be considered as soil conserving crops in dry land areas.

In all sections of this district where the prevailing crops are by their continual cultivation gradually reducing the available plant food in the soil and also changing the physical condition of the soil to the effect that erosion is lowering the productivity, we hereby determine such crops to be soil depleting crops in that district and recommend treatment under the Conservation Act as provided in our recommendation covering soil conservation and soil building.

Dry Land Crops

Soil Depleting:	Soil Conserving:
Cotton	
Corn	
Wheat	
Barley When Harvested or Hayed	When pastured off or plowed under for greenmanure
Oats	
Rye	
Emmer or Speltz	
Flax	
Potatoes	
Sorghums	Sorghums when left unharvested to prevent soil erosion
Millet	
Proso	
Peas when harvested	
Beans	
Mustard	
	Native and tame perennial grasses
Sunflowers	
	Alfalfa
Vegetable Canning Crops	
	Clovers
Peanuts - When harvested	
	Vetches

REPORT OF THE IRRIGATED LAND SUB-COMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON CROPS AND PRACTICES ON CROP LANDS

(Committee 1-a)

Report for the Irrigated and Humid District of the eleven Western States.

In general all crops left growing are soil conserving; crops harvested are soil depleting, and crops plowed under are soil improving.

Soil depleting crops are:	Soil conserving or soil improving crops are:
Cereals	Alfalfa
Orchards - Fruits	
Sorghums (Forage Grain)	Grass (Not noxious)
Vineyards	
Truck crops	Sweet clover
Beans	
Sugar beets	Other clovers
Flax	
Potatoes	Sesbania
Cotton	
Corn	Vetch
Field Peas	
Rice	
Mustard	
Peanuts	
Millet	

Practices which are soil depleting:
- Continuous harvesting of annual crops.
- Continual clean cultivation over a period of years of row crops and orchards

Practices which are soil conserving and for which benefit payments should be made on a diversion basis are:
- Green manuring
- Noxious weed control
- Permanent pasture establishment
- Planting, biennial or perennial legumes
- Terracing
- Cover cropping in orchards and vineyards
- Windbreaks and shelter belts

Nurse crops planted in connection with the establishing of soil conserving crops should be cut green for hay or clipped and left lay.

The use of cover crops in bearing orchards and vineyards should be paid for on a maintenance basis only.

Green manuring as a part of a double cropping system should be subsidized for maintenance only.

(Report adopted unanimously)

Joseph Andrasen, Chairman
C. W. Rubel, Secretary

Amendment to 1 a report, adopted by conference:
Amendment:
It is recommended that final determination of soil improvement or depletion crops or practices be made flexible to meet local conditions.

Regional Conference on Proposed Program
under
Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act

Salt Lake City, Utah
March 9, 10, and 11, 1936.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON RECOMMENDATIONS FOR A RANGE CONSERVATION PROGRAM

(Committee No. 1 b)

Hubbard Russell, Los Angeles, Cal., Chmn.
E. L. Potter, Corvallis, Oregon, Secy.
A. A. Johns, Prescott, Arizona
R. V. Boyle, Stafford, Arizona
W. P. Ting, San Francisco, California
James G. Brown, Montrose, Colorado
A. F. Curtis, Oak Creek, Colorado
I. H. Nash, Preston, Idaho
Robert Brown, Caldwell, Idaho
Tom Ross, Chinook, Montana
H. A. Snyder, Billings, Montana
Floyd Lee, Albuquerque, New Mexico
George Ogilvie, Lee, Nevada
F. T. Smith, Trestiedras, New Mexico
Hugh G. Calkins, Albuquerque, N. Mex.
Herman Oliver, John Day, Oregon
W. A. Schoenfeld, Corvallis, Oregon
J. M. Macfarlane, Salt Lake City, Utah
S. M. Jorgensen, Salina, Utah
Frank M. Rothrock, Spokane, Washington
J. B. Wilson, McKinley, Wyoming
Charles A. Myers, Evanston, Wyoming
C. R. Townsend, Ely, Nevada
Garrett Barrett, Heppner, Oregon

It is essential to the welfare of the livestock and agricultural interests of the western range states, that the watershed, range and forestry lands, whether privately or publicly owned, be included in the scope of the operation of this act for "making payments in connection with the normal production of any agricultural commodity for domestic consumption," (quoted from Section 2, page 5 of the Act), and that users thereof participate in the benefit payments to be derived from the operation of the Act.

Because of these conditions and in keeping with the purposes and spirit of the Act, the following recommendations are made:

1. That the Secretary of Agriculture offer conservation payments to the users of range grazing land, who make such adjustments in their use of such range grazing lands as will promote the purposes of the Act.

2. That the conservation payments be as nearly as possible such amounts as will compensate the livestock operator for the adjustments involved in such land-use program. Such payments, however, should be based upon regional averages rather than upon individual ranch conditions. Such conservation payments should be continued for a period of three years. After the period of three years the cooperator would be entitled to maintenance payments only.

3. That the conservation payments be measured by the reduction made in the total grazing use of such land, which in turn would be measured by the reduction in the numbers of livestock grazed on such lands, either through marketing for slaughter or by the adoption of range improvement practices such as deferred grazing or by the feeding of maintenance rations.

4. That the Secretary of Agriculture make soil maintenance payments to stockmen who use their range lands in such a manner that in the judgment of the county committee the range resources are maintained and conserved as provided in this Act. Such soil maintenance payments would be based upon the carrying capacity of the land.

(over)

5. That the terms, "tenants and share-croppers" shall be interpreted to include: All usual forms of tenancy on federal, state, county, railroad, and private land with payments based upon per head, acreage, or other bases, and including licensees and/or permittees with use for a limited or definite grazing season, together with contractors using the Pardido contract where charge is based on per head, acreage, combination or other bases.

6. That users of National Forest or Taylor Act lands who may reduce the numbers of livestock grazed on such lands as a result of the soil conservation program receive a non-use permit for the number of stock taken off the range. Such non-use permit to remain in effect for such length of time as the holder may wish to cooperate with the soil conservation program. Furthermore, that any and all betterment of public lands by reason of such cooperation shall be kept and accrue to such cooperator or cooperators.

RESOLUTIONS

In addition to the above report the following resolutions were adopted:

I. Resolved: That the attention of the Secretary of Agriculture be directed to Paragraph 12 of the Act whereby foreign and domestic markets can be expanded and surpluses disposed of together with Section 329, Public No. 320 whereby surplus commodities can be diverted from normal channels of trade and commerce, and that we urge that immediate operation thereunder be considered. Further, that attention likewise be given to the marketing agreement section of the AAA which was not invalidated by the Supreme Court.

Further: That we request the Secretary of Agriculture to call the attention of the President to the facts relating to the importation of livestock, livestock products, including dairy products, and livestock feeds of which there is a surplus, with a view of exercising the powers granted in Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act as amended, and if the facts justify an embargo, to impose such an embargo upon the importation of livestock, livestock products, including dairy products, and livestock feeds.

II. Your committee is convinced that any program of soil improvement under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, if it is to be of lasting benefit to the people of the United States must be so set up and administered that it will assure justice and equity between the great regions of the country as well as between the people living within any given region and so that it shall reduce rather than enlarge the dislocations which have grown out of the great depression.

Past experience has shown that the problems of the more populous farm acres of the country have loomed so large in the picture and have had such concentrated attention that it has been difficult to assure real benefits to these areas except at the expense and to the disadvantage of the range states.

Your committee, therefore, recognizes the problem and takes this means of urging that neither the farmers of the other parts of this country nor the administrators of the Act do anything which will bring further distress to the livestock industry of the western range states.

It is pointed out that any program which will bring about a further shift of livestock production from the range to the plains states and the south while simply adding another or substitute line to their farmers' production will rob many of the Western States of the main source of their income and support. The livestock industry in these States is even now in a precarious condition and to deny it the full measure of assistance which it should have may very easily bring about its practical destruction to the great dis-

advantage of the entire country. Therefore your committee earnestly recommends that:

1. No program under the Act be set up in any region which will by its action place an economic penalty on producers in other regions or areas.

2. Where the soil conserving crops grown on diverted acreage are sold from the farm, either directly or through livestock, the rate of payment for such acreage shall be equal to the maintenance payment only.

3.. Any program providing for a shift from soil depleting to soil conserving crops be accompanied by a proviso that benefits to be paid for such shifts shall not accrue when the acreage assigned to soil conserving crops will be used for increasing the number of livestock units.

Hubbard Russell, Chairman.

E. L. Potter, Secretary.

Regional Conference on Proposed Program
under
Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act

Salt Lake City, Utah
March 9, 10 and 11, 1936

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON DETERMINATION OF BASES AND CONDITIONS OF PAYMENT

(Committee No. 2)

George H. Wilson, Clarksburg, Calif., - Chairman

Walter J. Orr, Ft. Morgan, Colorado, - Secretary

A. G. Snyder, Phoenix, Arizona
C. M. Pickrell, Phoenix, Arizona
C. W. Hibbard, Los Angeles, California
W. B. Coberly, Los Angeles, California
George Sehlmeyer, Sacramento, California
A. L. Litel, Sterling, Colorado
A. E. McClymonds, Colorado Springs, Colorado
K. C. Barlow, Burley, Idaho
W. W. Godfrey, Boise, Idaho
N. L. Towne, Bozeman, Montana
H. D. Rolph, Joflin, Montana
H. C. Gardiner, Anaconda, Montana
L. E. Clive, Reno, Nevada
Glen Jensen, Preston, Idaho
G. G. Schweis, Reno, Nevada
L. E. Freudenthal, Las Cruces, N. M.
H. L. Hildwein, Clovis, New Mexico
C. V. Hemphill, Mosquero, New Mexico
N. C. Donaldson, Corvallis, Oregon
A. E. Engbretsen, Astoriz, Oregon
R. W. Gill, Portland, Oregon
Joseph Anderson, Salt Lake City, Utah
H. E. Larson, Promontory, Utah
E. J. Maynard, Logan, Utah
Carl King, Albion, Idaho
R. E. Burrows, Walla Walla, Wash.
Leslie Wilson, Ellensburg, Wash.
Carl L. Sackett, Cheyenne, Wyoming
W. H. Preuitt, Wheatland, Wyoming
A. E. McConnell, Lander, Wyoming

We the committee on "Determination of bases and conditions of payment", Salt Lake City conference, hereby report as follows:

(1) It is recommended that the soil depleting and soil conserving bases, for each farming unit, and also productivity of the land of such unit shall be established by the county committees on the basis of the crops and kinds of livestock by acreage or number, planted or fed, on all the land private or leased from Governmental agencies operated or grazed on such farming unit during the crop years 1934 and 1935, provided, however, that "contracted acres" under commodity contracts of the AAA, if not planted or devoted to soil depleting crops and uses in 1934 and 1935, shall be considered part of the soil depleting base and provided, further, that subject to rules approved by the State Committee and the Secretary of Agriculture, adjustments in such base acreage and productivity may be made in cases of exceptional drouth or other adverse conditions in the base years.

(2) It is recommended that two types of payment be made, namely:

(a) Diversion payment on the acres diverted from soil depleting crops to soil conserving crops, uses or practices.

(over)

(b) A maintenance payment for continuing during this program soil improving crops and practices on any acreage up to the soil conserving base.

It is further recommended that where the soil conserving crops grown on the diverted acreage are not used for commercial purposes, or where the practices conserve the fertility of the soil, the diversion payment shall be made in such cases, but where the soil conserving crops grown on diverted acreage are sold from the farm either directly or thru livestock, the rate of payment on such acreage shall be equal to the maintenance payment only.

It is further recommended that the rate per acre for maintenance payments shall be one-third of the rate per acre for diversion payments on land of equal productivity.

(3) That diversion payments be made on no more than 25% of the soil depleting base on any farming unit.

(4) That we recommend that the soil depletion base do not be divided on account of variation in degree of soil depletion.

(5) That the value of the crop shall be taken into consideration in the determination of productivity.

(6) That the payments to a farmer be flexible between reasonable minimum and maximum limits depending on the funds available.

Geo. A. Wilson, Chairman.

Walter J. Ott, Secretary.

Regional Conference on Proposed Program
under
Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act

Salt Lake City, Utah
March 9, 10 and 11, 1936

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON PRODUCER'S APPLICATION OR WORK-SHEET

(Committee No. 3)

Ezra Alishouse, Akron, Colo.-Chairman
Carl Teeter, Tucson, Ariz.-Secretary
A. A. Brock, Sacramento, Calif.
T. H. Summers, Ft. Collins, Colo.
H. L. Stafford, Monil Hill, Idaho
Alma Lindholm, Idaho Falls, Idaho
A. L. Barton, Bozeman, Mont.
J. Murray Edwards, Clovis, N. M.
Walter A. Holt, Pendleton, Ore.
W. P. Thomas, Logan, Utah
V. L. Martineau, Salt Lake, Utah
A. L. Hafenrichter, Pullman, Wash.
Archie M. Hale, Afton, Wyo.

We the committee on producer's application or work-sheet wish to make the following recommendation:

(1) That the document in question be called an application.

(2) That a closing date be set after which applications for participation will not be accepted. That this date be determined to conform with the practices of the region or state in which the application is signed.

(3) (a) That the application include data such as will become a permanent record to be used in determining future participation.

(b) That the following data be included in the application:

(1) The names and addresses of operator and owner, farm acreage, location and description of property.

(2) Map of land involved.

(3) Basic historical data on crops, livestock and farm practices.

(4) A statement of intended use of land for the current year and the future.

(5) Affirmation by the producer that statements are correct.

(6) Adjustments by the association.

Ezra Alishouse, Chairman.
Thos. H. Summers, Acting Secretary.

Regional Conference on Proposed Program
under
Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act

Salt Lake City, Utah
March 9, 10 and 11, 1936

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON SPECIAL CROPS AND SPECIAL CROP PROGRAM

(Committee No. 4)

Charles M. Kearney, Morrill, Nebraska, - Chairman
S. K. Warrick, Scotts Bluff, Nebraska, - Secretary
S. Carl Millin, Buckeye, Arizona
Carlisle Thorpe, Los Angeles, California
J. E. O'Neill, Fresno, California
W. J. Edinger, 244 California Street, San Francisco, California
M. L. Chenowith, Del Norte, Colorado
Henry Clark, Eaton, Colorado
Kenneth Quayle, Ault, Colorado
George T. Cobbley, Blackfoot, Idaho
R. H. Young, Parma, Idaho
F. E. Huddleston, Billings, Montana
George L. Knight, Missoula, Montana
L. E. Freudenthal, Las Cruces, New Mexico
A. B. Fite, Las Cruces, New Mexico
Earl H. Cooley, Salem, Oregon
R. W. Gill, Portland, Oregon
J. R. Rawlins, Draper, Utah
D. F. Smith, Salt Lake City, Utah
W. D. Criddle, Clearfield, Utah
Harry J. Allyn, Bellingham, Washington
Walter J. Robinson, Olympia, Washington
W. J. Gorst, Woodland, Wyoming
Arling Gardner, Cheyenne, Wyoming

It is the unanimous recommendation of this committee that all agricultural, horticultural and viticultural crops and dairy and poultry industries and their products come under the regular provisions and benefits of the soil conservation and domestic allotment Act.

The committee further recommends in the administration of Section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act as it relates to the productivity of the land in determining the amount of payments, that full recognition be given to the value of the particular crop being diverted to soil improvement purposes to the fullest extent to which the act permits.

Because of fluctuations in crop yield from season to season requiring diversion from the normal channels of domestic trade in years of surplus in order to prevent market demoralization, the necessity of improving marketing facilities, of retaining and in some cases re-establishing foreign outlets the committee recommends the utilization of: (1) provisions of the Agricultural program dealing with marketing agreements which were not affected by the recent decision of the Supreme Court in the Hoosac-Mills case, and under which provisions seasonal surpluses may be controlled and either diverted to non-competitive channels or exported to the great advantage of

(over)

the industries so affected; (2) Sections 32 and 37 of Public 320 of the 74th Congress and amended by Public 440, and by the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, which sections provide that 30 per cent of the Customs receipts of the duties collected under the Custom Laws for each calendar year and amounting to approximately $100,000,000 annually shall be allotted to the Secretary of Agriculture in connection with the encouragement of the exports of agricultural commodities and products thereof, and by increasing domestic consumption thereof by the diversion from normal channels of trade and including purchases for distribution through relief organizations and which also include payments in connection with the normal production of any agricultural commodity for domestic consumption and (3) Section 22 of Public 320 of the 74th Congress providing for the imposition of import quotas on agricultural commodities adversely affected by unrestricted heavy importations.

The committee finds that sugar and sugar beets are commodities produced under special and peculiar conditions in the U. S. requiring special treatment under a separate program and administration and is not a competitive crop.

Congress enacted separate and special sugar legislation in 1934 and a program was set up for its administration. That program was premised on the regulation by the Secretary of Agriculture of the supply of sugar for the domestic consuming market, through the administration of quotas. These quotas were agreed to by continental and insular producers, Cuba and other foreign nations and were not affected by the Supreme Court decision.

Further, the administration negotiated a reciprocal trade agreement with Cuba under which, in return for certain special concessions, the Cuban government agreed to co-operate and is co-operating in the maintenance of sugar imports to the United States in conformity with the quota fixed and administered by the Secretary of Agriculture.

It is vital that the quota provisions authorized and enacted by the Congress be effectively maintained if the sugar beet industry is to survive.

In consideration of these facts and others which might be enumerated, the committee recommends to the Secretary of Agriculture:

(a) That the benefits to the sugar beet farmers for the crops of 1934 and 1935 be continued for 1936 in conformity with the official announcement of the Secretary of Agriculture, under date of November 21, 1935.

(b) If the Secretary of Agriculture determines that he is unable to adopt the above program we then recommend that a sugar beet program be developed by the Secretary of Agriculture under the terms of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act on the basis of a domestic allotment plan that will give sugar beet farmers the measure of benefits that accrued to them in 1934 and 1935 and which will have due regard to the interests of sugar beet producers and sugar consumers.

(c) It is believed necessary to have a special program for sugar in order to coordinate the domestic industry with the existing quota legislation.

In the belief that but comparatively few agriculturists are familiar with the benefits available from the legislation here mentioned, this committee concludes these recommendations with the suggestion that the Department of Agriculture urge the Land-Grant Colleges, the Agricultural Extension Services, State Departments of Agriculture, Smith-Hughes Teachers and Farm Organizations, including cooperatives, to conduct an immediate, vigorous, educational campaign for the purpose of acquainting farmers with the facilities offered by these Acts and practical methods to be followed in operations thereunder in improving the conditions of Agriculture.

Charles M. Kearney, Chairman

S. K. Warrick, Secretary

REPORT OF THE COTTON SUB-COMMITTEE OF THE SPECIAL CROPS COMMITTEE

(Committee No. 4)

We the Cotton Sub-Committee of the Special Crops Committee submit the following report and recommendations:

1. That cotton produced under irrigation be considered a special crop for the following reasons:

   A. Because of its cash value as a producing crop ranking first in New Mexico and Arizona, and third in California.

   B. Due to its physical and cultural requirements which are entirely different from that of any other crop produced in the eleven Western States.

   C. Cotton under irrigation is a very highly specialized, high cost crop, grown intensively in large portions of New Mexico, Arizona and California.

2. That in the administration of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act in its application to cotton:

   A. The Secretary of Agriculture give consideration to the establishment of county sub-committees familiar with cotton production in the states heretofore mentioned.

   B. The base acreage and normal yields for cotton be established in accordance with the methods which were recommended in connection with the proposed Adjustment Program of 1936.

   C. The soil conservation and building practices which should be considered are to be the same as those proposed in the report of the committee on special crops.

   D. The total payments to be made with respect to any farming unit be made in one check, and participating producers be permitted to designate a joint payee for the purpose of securing funds or supplies for financing 1936 farming operations.

The general committee on Special Crops unanimously adopted the above report by the following motion made by L. D. Freudendal of Las Cruces, New Mexico and seconded by J. E. O'Niell of Fresno, California: "That the cotton report be accepted and submitted as a supplemental document to the regular report of the committee on Special Crops."

Regional Conference on Proposed Program
under
Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act

Salt Lake City, Utah
March 9, 10 and 11, 1936

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION AND PROCEDURE--STATE, COUNTY AND COMMUNITY.

(Committee 5)

Frank L. Ballard, Corvallis, Oregon, - Chairman
F. E. Balmer, Pullman, Washington, - Secretary
George W. Barr, Tucson, Arizona
B. H. Crocheron, Berkeley, California
John Morris, Golden, Colorado
H. E. Hogsett, Greeley, Colorado
W. J. Crea, Cottonwood, Idaho
J. H. Reardon, Moscow, Idaho
W. E. Westlake, Bozeman, Montana
T. E. Buckman, Reno, Nevada
W. A. Wunsch, Las Cruces, New Mexico
G. R. Quesenberry, Las Cruces, New Mexico
N. E. Dodd, 306 U. S. Courthouse
W. W. Owens, Logan, Utah
John Alleman, Springville, Utah
Ervin E. King, 3104 Weston Avenue, Seattle, Washington
A. E. Bowman, Laramie, Wyoming

While this committee recognizes that the success of the soil conservation and domestic allotment program depends upon the producer assuming his full share of the responsibility, yet we feel sure that the cooperation of the producers, the Land Grant colleges and their Extension Services, the U. S. Department of Agriculture and State Departments of Agriculture will all be necessary to obtain the best results.

The following recommendations are made that:

1. A State Committee of five be named in each state as a state administrative board by the Secretary of Agriculture, one to represent the Extension Service, one the Bureau of Crop and Livestock Estimates and three representative producers.

2. A temporary county committee of not more than seven resident members shall be set up in each county by the State Committee. This committee may consist of the chairmen of existing county allotment committees, and the chairman of the county agriculture program planning committee or such other farm representatives as may be selected. The selection of the committee shall be subject to the approval of the state soil conservation and domestic allotment administrative committee.

3. Concerning the temporary community committees, if in the judgment of the temporary county committee, the community committees are deemed necessary to carry on educational work within the communities, such committees shall be appointed by the temporary county committee.

F. L. Ballard, Chairman

F. E. Balmer, Secretary

Regional Conference on Proposed Program
under
Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act

Salt Lake City, Utah
March 9, 10 and 11, 1936

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON PROGRAM PLANNING FOR 1937.

(Committee 6)

L. R. Breithaupt, Corvallis, Oregon, - Chairman
O. J. Wheatley, Logan, Utah, - Secretary
Sam S. Wallace, Mesa, Arizona
J. E. Tippett, Berkeley, California
John Robinson, Collinsville, California
C. A. Lory, Ft. Collins, Colorado
C. A. Buettel, Covington, Colorado
J. P. Olson, Wolcott, Colorado
M. E. Willis, Rupert, Idaho
E. T. Benson, Boise, Idaho
P. L. Slagvold, Bozeman, Montana
A. P. Bruce, Helena, Montana
V. E. Scott, Reno, Nevada
A. B. Fite, Las Cruces, New Mexico
Solon T. White, Salem, Oregon
R. A. Ward, Portland, Oregon
R. B. West, Salt Lake City, Utah
E. V. Ellington, Pullman, Washington
A. W. Willis, Laramie, Wyoming

Preamble: Recognizing that any effective long-time program of soil conservation must be built on the basis of certain sound fundamental principles your committee recommends the following for consideration in connection with the 1937 and the permanent soil conservation program.

Statement of Principles:

1. It is essential that full recognition be given to the principle that in this act agricultural industries are cooperating with the Government for the benefit of all agriculture not only through active participation in benefits but also in the assumption of joint responsibility.

2. It is considered essential in the administration of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act that every effort be made to keep in view the necessity for a technically competent and stable administrative organization which can function continuously without unnecessary disturbance.

3. It is fundamental to any permanent program of soil conservation that it be based upon sound farming and range practices which, in turn, fit into a system of sound farming within areas or localities.

4. In order to reward impartially individual farm practices and systems of farming or range use which are conducive to soil conservation it is essential that there be developed a sound basis of factual data through carefully coordinated and extensive research.

(over)

5. It is recognized that a fundamental part of any successful program of soil conservation must be the dissemination of information of farmers in respect to practices which constitute sound soil conservation upon farm and range land.

6. It is recognized that in the administration of this act numerous problems will arise which can not be satisfactorily dealt with on a state basis alone. It is therefore essential that procedure be adopted which will seek to coordinate state programs within regions and within the country as a whole.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. To assist in effectuating the principles herein stated for the 1937 program and subsequent programs, we recommend that a general advisory committee be set up in each state at an early date. This committee should be broadly representative of the agricultural interests and industries and include in its membership the State administrative board of the 1936 Soil Conservation program and the State Committee on Coordination of Research for Soil Conservation. It is also recommended that this committee enlist the cooperation of all agencies and agricultural organizations in a comprehensive educational effort in land use and soil conservation. It is important that the general advisory committee should study closely the progress of 1936 program and all other matters incident to the 1937 and 1938 program in particular. It should be prepared to make recommendations at a regional conference which we recommend be held in October, 1936.

SPECIAL RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING RESEARCH:

We recommend that participation in soil conservation research be coordinated.

It is suggested that in each state a committee on coordination of research for soil conservation be set up consisting of representatives of State and Federal agencies concerned with soil conservation research. In meeting the need for a coordinated and sound soil conservation program, research should make available all necessary analysis, facts and data pertaining to the following:

1. Range Land: Coordination of research pertaining to types of ranges, livestock, population, carrying capacity, methods of management and changes in use, stocking and methods of management conducive to conservation and economic use. In addition any other range problems pertinent to the administration of the act.

2. Irrigation Agriculture: This should include a study of the supply and the economic uses of water, cropping system and farming practices. Also a study of the best intergration and desirable adjustment in the use of

irrigated, dry farm, and range land and any other analysis necessary for the effectuation of this act.

3. Dry Land: This research should include an analysis of soil conservation and farm management practices, cropping systems, desirable adjustments in the interest of soil conservation and efficient farming in relationship to other types of farming; and any other research necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

4. In carrying out the foregoing we recommend that further research be properly coordinated with the research of the Regional Agricultural Adjustment Project of 1935; and also with the County Program Planning Project now in progress. We further recommend that programs of research be so organized as to make the maximum use of all pertinent findings of both state and Federal agencies and be so organized as to become a permanent research program supplying continuously information and analysis for the support of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Program. Research programs should also contribute to the other public efforts in the development and carrying out of agricultural policies and programs, including those of the extension service and other educational agencies.

L. E. Breithaupt - Chairman

O. J. Wheatley - Secretary

Regional Conference on Proposed Program
under
Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act

Salt Lake City, Utah
March 9, 10 and 11, 1936

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON LANDLORD AND TENANT PAYMENTS

(Committee No. 7)

A. L. Anderson, Ault, Colorado, Chairman
G. S. Quate, Salt Lake City, - Secretary
C. D. Vasburgh, Buckeye, Arizona
Warren Egbert, Knights Landing, California
N. N. Bailey, Matheson, Colorado
W. C. Swinehart, Denver, Colorado
W. W. Deal, Nampa, Idaho
J. N. Dayley, Twin Falls, Idaho
H. M. Daniels, Helena, Montana
H. W. Bunston, Hardin, Montana
C. V. Hemphill, Mosquero, New Mexico
G. W. Potts, Jefferson, Oregon
J. H. Beus, Ogden, Utah
E. K. Winder, Salt Lake City, Utah
W. G. Grimm, Everett, Washington
Hans Hansen, Lovell, Wyoming

The following subjects were discussed and acted upon as recorded herein. The proper division of payments to be made as between:-

1. Cash Tenant and Landlord.
2. Fixed commodity tenant and landlord.
3. Purchaser of land by contract or by fixed commodity payments and landlord.
4. Share tenant and landlord.
5. Managing share tenant and landlord.
6. Share tenant with cash payment for hay and pasture land and landlord.
7. Share cropper and landlord.
8. Other lease or rental combinations as may be suggested.

The following action was taken on subjects referred to by number.

1. All grants should go to the tenant.
2. All grants should be made to the tenant.
3. Purchaser of land should be given all benefits.
4. Resolved that in the case of share tenants and landlords payment should be made in the proportions named in the lease as to the division of the crops.
5. Dismissed as not understood.
6. On lands for which he pays cash the renter should receive his share of grants. As to the share, part of the farm payment should be made in the same manner as provided for under item number 4.
7. Resolved that this committee endorse the principle of paying to the share cropper the same portion of the benefits arising out of this program as he would have had out of the crop had there been no program.

(over)

8. No action.

It was resolved that a land unit for the purpose of making grants is defined as that tract of land which is operated and used by an individual whether he be landlord or tenant.

It is further resolved that lands held by one owner and operated by one tenant shall be classed as a unit for the purpose of making grants under the terms of the Soil Conservation Act regardless of the fact that such lands may be on more than one tract.

A. L. Anderson, Chairman.
G. S. Quate, Secretary.